UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,450	09/30/2003	Nathaniel Marvin Myhre	60001.0384US01/MS303947.1	5594

27488 7590 10/03/2006

MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER	
DAYE, CHELCIE L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2161	

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/675,450	MYHRE, NATHANIEL MARVIN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chelcie Daye	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 July 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7 and 9-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7 and 9-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is issued in response to applicant's amendment filed July 31, 2006.

2. Claims 1-7 and 9-30 are presented. Claim 8 is cancelled and no claims added.

3. Claims 1-7 and 9-30 are pending.

4. Applicant's arguments filed July 31, 2006, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williamson (US Patent No. 6,785,417) in view of Roche (US Patent No. 6,859,800) filed April 26, 2000.

Regarding Claim 1, Williamson disclose a computer-implemented method for searching through ink characters within an electronic document comprising:

accepting, by a computer, a search query (columns 8-9, lines 67 and 1-5, respectively, Williamson), where the search query comprises a search query word (Fig.2, item 80, Williamson). However Williamson is silent with respect to the search query comprising a list of electronic documents containing the

electronic document. On the other hand, Roche discloses the search query comprising a list of electronic documents containing the electronic document (Fig.6; columns 13-14, lines 60-67 and 1-4, Roche). Williamson and Roche are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of query acceptance for a collection of documents. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Roche's teachings into the Williamson system. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine as suggested by Roche at column 4, lines 1-9, in order to provide a search and query system which considers the query in relation to the information available within a large body of information, thus fulfilling information needs. Also, the combination of Williamson in view of Roche disclose

retrieving a search query character from the search query word in the search query (column 8, lines 1-5, Williamson);

accepting an ink word from the electronic document (column 4, lines 25-28, Williamson);

accepting an ink alternate word (column 5, lines 7-10, Williamson), wherein the ink alternate word is an estimation of the ink word (column 5, lines 15-18, Williamson);

retrieving an ink alternate character for the ink alternate word (column 7, lines 1-4, Williamson);

determining when the ink alternate character matches the search query character (column 8, lines 61-67, Williamson);

repeating stages d-f for a plurality of ink alternate characters (column 12, lines 45-54, Williamson)[1];

returning a match list of the ink alternate character matches resulting from stage (f) (column 11, lines 18-25, Williamson).

Regarding Claim 2, the combination of Williamson in view of Roche, disclose the computer-implemented method further comprising:

accepting another ink alternate character for the ink alternate word in response to a positive determination that the ink alternate character matches the search query character (column 11, lines 18-25, Williamson);

accepting another search query character from the search query word (column 11, lines 36-39, Williamson);

determining when the other ink alternate character matches the other search query character (column 11, lines 39-42, Williamson);

determining when the other search query character is the last character in the search query word (column 12, lines 22-26, Williamson)[2] in response to a positive determination that the other ink alternate character matches the other search query character (column 12, lines 37-39, Williamson); and

[1] Examiner Notes: Fig.8 shows step 816 looping around back up to step 802, in order to repeat the process again.
[2] Examiner Notes: The last character for the search query corresponds to 'e'.

sending a match to the match list (column 11, lines 18-19, Williamson) in response to a positive determination that the other search query character is the last character in the search query word (column 12, lines 22-26, Williamson)[3].

Regarding Claim 3, the combination of Williamson in view of Roche, disclose the computer-implemented method further comprising:

determining when the search query contains another search query word (Fig.8, step 814; column 12, lines 51-54, Williamson);

retrieving a search query character of the other search query word in response to a positive determination that the search query contains the other search query word (column 11, lines 18-25, Williamson); and

determining when the search query character of the other search query word matches the ink alternate character of the ink alternate word (column 11, lines 39-42, Williamson).

Regarding Claim 4, the combination of Williamson in view of Roche, disclose the computer-implemented method further comprising:

accepting another ink alternate word in response to a determination that the ink alternate character does not match the search query character (column 12, lines 55-60, Williamson);

[3] Examiner Notes: The determination was positive because the outcome was a match.

retrieving an ink alternate character for the other ink alternate word (column 7, lines 1-4, Williamson);

determining when the ink alternate character for the other ink alternate word matches the search query character (column 11, lines 39-42, Williamson); and

repeating steps a-c for a plurality of ink alternate words (column 12, lines 59-60, Williamson).

Regarding Claim 5, the combination of Williamson in view of Roche, disclose a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps recited in Claim 1 (column 3, lines 12-22, Williamson).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 6-9,12-15, and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roche (US Patent No. 6,859,800) filed April 26, 2000 in view of Lopresti (US Patent No. 5,832,474) filed February 26, 1996.

Regarding Claims 6,12, and 25, Roche discloses a computer-implemented method for searching within an electronic document comprising:

accepting, by a computer, a search query (column 9, lines 48-50, Roche) comprising a search query word to be sought in the electronic document (Fig.6; column 13, lines 44-45, Roche);

determining when the search query word matches at least one set of characters in the electronic document (column 13, lines 54-56, Roche);

adding a match to a match list in response to a positive determination that the search query word matches the set of characters in the electronic document (column 23, lines 24-31, Roche);

processing a boolean operator in the search query (column 35, lines 59-64, Roche);

determining when the match to the first query word before the boolean operator and the match to the first query word after the boolean operator satisfy a spatial relationship (column 2, lines 24-30, Roche)[4], the spatial relationship being satisfied when the match to the first query word before the boolean operator and the match to the first query word after the boolean operator occur within a portion of the document currently displayed in a viewable area (column 37, lines 9-26, Roche);

sorting the matches in the match list (column 11, lines 4-6, Roche)[5];

---

[4] Examiner Notes: The proximity operators correspond to the satisfying of the spatial relationship, because the user will designate a specific distance allowed between two terms and anything else is unacceptable.

[5] Examiner Notes: "Ranking" corresponds to sorting.

identifying the match in the match list (column 20, lines 32-37, Roche) that is closest to a match point in the electronic document (column 21, lines 2-5, Roche); and

navigating through the electronic document to the match closest to the match point (column 22, lines 23-35, Roche). While Roche does disclose identifying the match closest to the match point, Roche is silent with respect to highlighting the closest point. On the other hand, Lopresti discloses highlighting the match closest to the match point (column 7, lines 33-40, Lopresti). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Lopresti's teachings into the Roche system. Roche and Lopresti are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of accepting and fulfilling a queries need that supports text data and user-drawn annotations. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the highlighting feature of Lopresti with the Roche system as suggested by Lopresti at column 7, lines 36-41, in order to intensify the matching annotation (i.e. to help the desired match stand out visually for the user). As a result, highlighting the interesting portion of the document allows the user to identify the text more quickly, saving valuable time.

Regarding Claim 7, the combination of Roche in view of Lopresti, disclose the computer-implemented method further comprising:

retrieving document content from the electronic document (column 13, lines 4-6, Roche)[6];

accepting at least one document content character from the document content (column 12, lines 30-37, Roche);

determining when additional document content exists in the electronic document (columns 26-27, lines 64-67 and 1-2, respectively, Roche); and

repeating steps a-c for the additional document content (column 21, lines 59-61, Roche).

Regarding Claim 9 and 29, the combination of Roche in view of Lopresti, disclose the computer-implemented method wherein processing a boolean operator in the search query comprises:

accepting the boolean operator from the search query (column 1, lines 29-33, Roche);

accepting a match to a first query word before the boolean operator from the match list (column 2, lines 9-17, Roche)[7];

accepting a match to a first query word after the boolean operator from the match list (column 2, lines 9-17, Roche)[8];

determining when the match to the first query word before the boolean operator and the match to the first query word after the boolean operator satisfy a

[6] Examiner Notes: The retrieving of the document is performed by the retrieval application (column 11, lines 18-21, Roche).
[7] Examiner Notes: The first query word before the boolean is "Alexander" the match is "Alexander Heard".
[8] Examiner Notes: "Bell" represents the first query word after the boolean and the match is "Packard Bell".

spatial relationship (column 2, lines 24-30, Roche)[9]; and

removing from the match list the match to the first query word before the boolean operator and the match to the first query word after the boolean operator in response to a failure to satisfy the spatial relationship (column 2, lines 40-52, Roche)[10].

Regarding Claims 13 and 26, the combination of Roche in view of Lopresti, disclose the computer-implemented method wherein the match point comprises the cursor location in the electronic document (column 5, lines 29-31, Lopresti).

Regarding Claims 14 and 27, the combination of Roche in view of Lopresti, disclose the computer-implemented method wherein sorting the matches comprises sorting the matches in the match list by the page number in which the match is located in the electronic document (column 17, lines 31-34, Roche).

Regarding Claim 15, the combination of Roche in view of Lopresti, disclose the computer-implemented method further comprising:

---

[9] Examiner Notes: The proximity operators correspond to the satisfying of the spatial relationship, because the user will designate a specific distance allowed between two terms and anything else is unacceptable.

[10] Examiner Notes: Reducing the number of irrelevant documents correspond to removing.

sorting a plurality of matches in the match list by page number in the electronic document (column 17, lines 31-34, Roche);

accepting a first match and a second match from the match list (column 13, lines 60-61, Roche);

determining when at least one character is between the documents content characters corresponding to the first match and the second match in the electronic document (column 2, lines 33-37, Roche)[11];

merging the first match and the second match in the match list in response to a negative determination of at least one character between the document content characters corresponding to the first match and the second match (column 12, lines 53-57, Lopresti)[12];

retrieving a next match in the match list (column 26, lines 64-66, Roche); and

repeating steps b-e for the plurality of matches in the match list (columns 26-27, lines 66-67 and 1-2, respectively, Roche).

9. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roche (US Patent No. 6,859,800) filed April 26, 2000 in view of Lopresti (US Patent No. 5,832,474) filed February 26, 1996, as applied to claims 6-9,12-15, and 25-29 above, and further in view of "Software Patent Institute Database of Software Technologies", Published 1997, will be referred to hereinafter as "SPI".

Regarding Claim 10, the combination of Roche in view of Lopresti, disclose the computer-implemented method wherein the spatial relationship is satisfied when the match to the first query word before the Boolean operator and the match to tie first query word after the boolean operator. However, Roche in view of Lopresti, are silent with respect to the spatial relationship occurring within the same paragraph of the electronic document. On the other hand, SPI discloses the spatial relationship occurring within the same paragraph of the electronic document (pg.3, lines 7-26, SPI). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate SPI's teachings into the Roche in view of Lopresti system. The combination of Roche in view of Lopresti, and SPI are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of using search operators in order to search. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the combination of Roche in view of Lopresti with the SPI teaching in order to allow the user to designate the spacing between two terms, which allows the for commanding the system to retrieve documents which contain the terms close to each other. Boolean operators are used for searching electronic documents and determining a query by joining terms. As a result, this allows for more control over the query results and reduction in number of irrelevant documents.

---

[11] Examiner Notes: The search is for "Alexander NEAR Bell", an optional outcome is "Alexander Graham

Regarding Claim 11, the combination of Roche in view of Lopresti, and further in view of SPI, disclose the computer-implemented method wherein the spatial relationship is satisfied when the match to the first query word before the boolean operator and the match to the first query word after the boolean operator occur within the same page of the electronic document (pg.3-4, lines 41-48 and 1-8, respectively, SPI).

10. Claims 16-24 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roche (US Patent No. 6,859,800) filed April 26, 2000 in view of Lopresti (US Patent No. 5,832,474) filed February 26, 1996, and further in view of Williamson (US Patent No. 6,785,417) filed August 22, 2000.

Regarding Claims 16 and 30, the combination of Roche in view of Lopresti, disclose the computer-implemented method wherein determining when the search query word matches at least one set of characters in the electronic document comprises:

accepting one of the search query words from the search query (column 13, lines 44-45, Roche); and

accepting a document content character from the electronic document (column 12, lines 30-37, Roche). However, the combination of Roche in view of Lopresti, is silent with respect to determining when the character is an ink

---

Bell", wherein Graham is an example of characters between the two matches.

character or a text character; and conducting an ink character match in response to a determination that the first document content character is an ink character. On the other hand, Williamson discloses determining when the character is an ink character or a text character (column 4, lines 34-43, Williamson); and conducting an ink character match in response to a determination that the first document content character is an ink character (column 7, lines 31-35, Williamson). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Williamson's teachings of determining the character type, into the Roche in view of Lopresti system. The combination of Roche in view of Lopresti, and Williamson are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of accepting and fulfilling a queries need with text data and ink data. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine as suggested by Williamson at column 14, lines 36-41, in order to allow the system to be more flexible and more varied with customization in order to meet a variety of scenarios.

Regarding Claim 17, the combination of Roche in view of Lopresti, and further in view of Williamson, disclose the computer-implemented method wherein conducting a text character match comprises:

comparing the document content character to the search query character to determine if the characters match (column 18, lines 47-51, Roche);

---

[12] Examiner Notes: The "errors" are indications of a negative determination.

determining when the search query word contains additional characters in response to a positive determination that the search query character matches the document content character (columns 26-27, lines 64-67 and 1-2, respectively, Roche);

retrieving another one of the search query characters in response to a positive determination that the search query word contains additional characters (column 11, lines 18-25, Williamson); and

sending a match to the match list (column 11, lines 18-19, Williamson) in response to a negative determination that the search query word contains additional characters (column 12, lines 22-26, Williamson).

Regarding Claim 18, the combination of Roche in view of Lopresti, and further in view of Williamson, disclose the computer-implemented method further comprising:

determining when the electronic document comprises a next document content character (columns 26-27, lines 64-67 and 1-2, respectively, Roche) in response to a negative determination that the search query character matches the document content character;

retrieving the next document content character in response to a positive determination that the electronic document comprises the next document content character (column 13, lines 4-6, Roche); and

comparing the search query character to the next document content character to determine when the characters match (column 18, lines 47-51, Roche).

Regarding Claim 19, the combination of Roche in view of Lopresti, and further in view of Williamson, disclose the computer implemented method further comprising:

determining when the search query contains another search query word (Fig.8, step 814; column 12, lines 51-54, Williamson);

retrieving a search query character of the other search query word in response to a positive determination that the search query contains the other search query word (column 11, lines 18-25, Williamson); and

comparing the document content character to the search query character of the other search query word to determine if the characters match (column 18, lines 47-51, Roche).

Regarding Claim 20, the combination of Roche in view of Lopresti, and further in view of Williamson, discloses the computer-implemented method wherein conducting an ink character match comprises:

accepting an ink alternate word (column 5, lines 7-10, Williamson), wherein the ink alternate word is an estimation of the actual ink word received by the electronic document (column 5, lines 15-18, Williamson);

retrieving an ink alternate character for the ink alternate word (column 7, lines 1-4, Williamson);

determining when the ink alternate character matches the search query character (column 8, lines 61-67, Williamson);

accepting another ink alternate word in response to a determination that the ink alternate character does not match the search query character (column 12, lines 55-60, Williamson); and

repeating stages b-d for the other ink alternate word (column 12, lines 45-54, Williamson).

Regarding Claim 21, the combination of Roche in view of Lopresti, and further in view of Williamson, disclose the computer implemented method further comprising:

accepting another ink alternate character for the ink alternate word (column 11, lines 18-25, Williamson);

accepting another search query character from the search query word (column 11, lines 36-39, Williamson);

determining when the other ink alternate character matches the other search query character (column 11, lines 39-42, Williamson);

determining when the other search query character is the last character in the search query word (column 12, lines 22-26, Williamson) in response to a

positive determination that the other ink alternate character matches the other search query character (column 12, lines 37-39, Williamson); and

sending a match to the match list (column 11, lines 18-19, Williamson) in response to a positive determination that the other search query character is the last character in the search query word (column 12, lines 22-26, Williamson).

Regarding Claim 22, the combination of Roche in view of Lopresti, and further in view of Williamson, disclose the computer-implemented method further comprising:

determining when the search query contains another search query word (Fig.8, step 814; column 12, lines 51-54, Williamson);

retrieving a search query character of the other search query word in response to a positive determination that the search query contains the other search query word (column 11, lines 18-25, Williamson); and

determining when the search query character of the other search query word matches the ink alternate character of the ink alternate word (column 11, lines 39-42, Williamson).

Regarding Claim 23, the combination of Roche in view of Lopresti, and further in view of Williamson, disclose the computer-implemented method further comprising:

determining when the electronic document comprises additional document

content characters (columns 26-27, lines 64-67 and 1-2, respectively, Roche);

retrieving a next document content character in response to a positive, determination that the electronic document comprises additional document content characters (column 11, lines 18-25, Williamson); and

determining when the next document content character is an ink character or a text character (column 4, lines 34-43, Williamson).

Regarding Claim 24, the combination of Roche in view of Lopresti, and further in view of Williamson, disclose a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps recited in Claim 6 (column 3, lines 12-22, Williamson).

Response to Arguments

In regards to claim 1, applicant argues "Williamson does not disclose the newly amended limitation "accepting a search query, where the search query comprises a search query word and a list of electronic documents".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The newly applied reference of Roche was therefore combined with the Williamson reference to further disclose the newly amended limitation. As such the combination of Williamson in view of Roche, does disclose the newly amended limitation of "accepting a search query, where the search query comprises a search query word and a list of electronic documents" as disclosed in the action above. As a result, applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues, "amended claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art, for at least the reason that it recites, 'determining when the match to the first query word before the boolean operator and the match to the first query word after the boolean operator satisfy a spatial relationship, wherein the spatial relationship is satisfied when the match to the first query word before the boolean operator and the match to the first query word after the boolean operator occur within a portion of the document currently displayed in a viewable area'".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. There is no previous nor present limitation within the language of claim 1 for "determining when the match to the first query word before the boolean operator and the match to the first query word after the boolean operator satisfy a spatial relationship, wherein the spatial relationship is satisfied when the match to the first query word before the boolean operator and the match to the first query word after the boolean operator occur within a portion of the document currently displayed in a viewable area". Therefore, applicants arguments that amended claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art are moot.

In regards to claim 10, applicant argues, "the examiner states that Roche in view of Lopresti do not teach a spatial relationship occurring within an electronic document", therefore Roche in view of Lopresti cannot teach the newly amended limitation of "spatial relationships being satisfied when occurring within a portion of the document displayed in a viewable area".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. With respect to the rejection of claim 10, examiner states within the office action dated 3/28/2006, "Roche in view of Lopresti, are silent with respect to the spatial relationship occurring within the same paragraph of the electronic document". The focus was on the limitation of "occurring within the same paragraph", and as a result the non-patent literature reference of "Software Patent Institute Database of Software Technologies" was added, in order to properly reject the limitation of "occurring within the same paragraph. However, the applicant is arguing Roche in view of Lopresti do not teach "*a spatial relationship occurring within an electronic document*". Examiner would like to point out that the search query is sought within an electronic document and therefore discloses the use of the electronic document (see action above). Also, examiner points to dependent claim 9 (which is a dependent of claim 6), further discuss determining a match in order to satisfy a spatial relationship (see action above). Therefore, since claim 10 is dependent from claim 9, which is dependent from claim 6, the disclosure of "a spatial relationship occurring within an electronic document", was previously provided, thereby focusing the attention on the relationship "occurring within the same paragraph".

In regards to claims 6 and 25, applicant argues, "Roche and Lopresti do not disclose the newly amended limitation of wherein the spatial relationship is satisfied when the match to the first query word before the boolean operator and the match to the first query word after the boolean operator occur within a portion of the document currently displayed in a viewable area".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated in the action above, Roche discloses at column 2, lines 24-30; wherein the proximity operators correspond to the satisfying of the spatial relationship, because the user will designate a specific distance allowed between two terms and anything else is unacceptable. Also, to further explain Roche discloses at column 2, lines 9-17; wherein the first query word before the boolean is 'Alexander' the match is "Alexander Heard" and 'Bell' represents the first query word after the boolean and the match is "Packard Bell". Also, Roche discloses at column 37, lines 9-26; wherein the system displays a portion of the match that correspond to the query, the results are formatted for presentation by a web browser. Therefore, the combination of Roche in view of Lopresti disclose the newly amended limitation of wherein the spatial relationship is satisfied when the match to the first query word before the boolean operator and the match to the first query word after the boolean operator occur within a portion of the document currently displayed in a viewable area.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.

Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Points of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chelcie Daye whose telephone number is 571-272-3891. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on 571-272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chelcie Daye
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100
September 18, 2006

JEFFREY GAFFIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100